

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 435

CE 007 173

TITLE Proceedings of the Joint Meeting: National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (10th, Washington, D.C., May 16-17, 1974).

INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 17 May 74

NOTE 42p.; For related documents, see CE 007 171-175; Photographs will not reproduce in microfiche

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS \*Advisory Committees; Career Education; \*Conference Reports; Educational Administration; \*Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; \*Educational Needs; Federal Aid; Government Role; National Organizations; Speeches; State Agencies; \*Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS CETA; Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; NACVE; National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education; SACVE; State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

## ABSTRACT

The proceedings of the tenth joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, held in May, 1974, is presented. The agenda and highlights of the meeting are provided. The major part of the document consists of the texts of speeches presented during the meeting. Kenneth Hoyt discussed the relationship between career education and vocational education and presented some responses to criticisms of career education. Jack Jennings discussed the administration and funding of advisory councils from the congressional point of view. Ben Burdetsky discussed the purpose of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and its relationship to vocational education programs. William Lehman discussed some problems and issues in the implementation and administration of vocational education programs. The importance of vocational education for a successful future was discussed by Jack Higbee with particular reference made to the State of Utah. (EC)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  
\* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort \*  
\* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal \*  
\* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality \*  
\* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \*  
\* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not \*  
\* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions \*  
\* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED123435

# PROCEEDINGS OF THE JOINT MEETING

National and State Advisory Councils  
On Vocational Education

May 16 & 17, 1974  
Washington, D. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . .	5
Agenda . . . . .	7
Highlights of the Meeting . . . . .	9
Presentations . . . . .	13
Dr. Kenneth Hoyt . . . . .	15
Associate Commissioner for Career Education	
Mr. Jack Jennings . . . . .	23
Majority Counsel	
General Subcommittee on Education	
U.S. House of Representatives	
Mr. Ben Burdetsky . . . . .	27
Deputy Assistant Secretary	
U.S. Department of Labor.	
Honorable William Lehman . . . . .	34
Congressman	
State of Florida	
Mr. Jack Higbee . . . . .	41
Executive Director	
State of Utah Advisory Council	

## INTRODUCTION

The State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, created by Congress in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, were designed as independent boards to evaluate and recommend changes in the planning and operation of vocational education. At the time of their creation, the State and National Advisory Councils agreed that it would be mutually beneficial to meet semi-annually to discuss major issues and exchange information and ideas. The first joint meeting was held in November 1969. Subsequent meetings have been held in May 1970, November 1970, April 1971, November 1971, May 1972, November 1972, April 1973, and November 1973.

The Tenth Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was held May 16-17, 1974 in Washington, D.C. Attending the meeting were representatives of every State and Territorial Council and the National Council.

As State Councils have continued to progress, as they have become more sophisticated in their evaluation reports and dynamic in affecting the course of vocational education within their states, these meetings have proved most valuable. Council members not only have the opportunity to view developments in vocational education from a national perspective but also to discuss the work of Advisory Councils with their peers from other states.

We hope that this written record of the meeting will prove useful to State Council members and others interested in the concerns and activities of State Councils.

Calvin Dellefield  
Executive Director  
National Advisory Council

# AGENDA AGENDA

## AGENDA

Thursday, May 16: Normandy-Savoy Room

9:00am-1:00pm	Registration	
1:00pm-1:20pm	Welcomes	Dr. Robert White Hon. James A. Rhodes
1:20pm-2:00pm	Report from NACVE	
2:00pm-2:45pm	Address	Dr. Kenneth Hoyt Associate Commissioner for Career Education
2:45pm-3:00pm	Break	
3:00pm-4:00pm	Panel of Congressional Staffers	
4:00pm-4:30pm	Report of the U.S. Office of Education	Dr. William Pierce Deputy Commissioner
4:30pm	Recess	

Friday, May 17, Dophine Room

8:00am-9:30am	Breakfast	
	Address	Mr. Ben Burdetsky Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor
9:30am-10:30am	Workshops:	
	State Plan:	Mayflower Room
	Evaluation:	Room 232
	Legislative Relations:	Normandy Room
	Council Management:	Balmoral Room
	Public Information and Citizen Views:	
	Esplanade Room	
	Local Advisory Councils:	Savoy Room

10:30am-10:45 am	Break	
10:45am-11:45am	Workshops:	
	State Plan:	Mayflower Room
	Evaluation:	Room 232
	Legislative Relations:	Normandy Room
	Council Management:	Balmoral Room
	Public Information and Citizen Views:	
	Esplanade Rome	
	Local Advisory Councils:	Savoy Room
11:45am-noon	Break	
Noon-1:45pm	Luncheon	
	Address	Honorable William Lehman Congressman State of Florida
2:00pm-3:00pm	Workshops on Legislation	
3:00pm-3:30pm	General Discussion	
3:30pm-4:00pm	Closing Remarks	Mr. Jack Higbee Executive Director State of Utah Advisory Council

# HIGHLIGHTS



# NACVE SACVE

## HIGHLIGHTS OF THE JOINT MEETING

The first semi-annual joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education of 1974 was held in Washington, D.C. at the Ramada Inn on May 16th and 17th. The Council members and guests were welcomed by meeting chairman Robert White, Chairman of the South Carolina Council, and Donald McDowell of the National Council.

Business was opened with the National Council's report, consisting of five committee reports presented by Don McDowell, Jo Ann Cullen, John Thiele and David Van Alstyne.

After the reports Miss Cullen was honored by the State of Oklahoma with a citation issued by Oklahoma Senator Deway Bartlett conferring on her official status as an "Okie."

Dr. Kenneth Hoyt, Associate Commissioner of Career Education, was then introduced by Dr. Robert Kaiser, Chairman of the Career Education Advisory Council of Iowa. Dr. Hoyt spoke about the career education movement, addressing each of the criticisms of the concept which had come to his attention and emphasizing its need of vocational education's support (see text of speech on p. 15).

Mr. Terrell Bell, the new Associate Commissioner Designate of Education, was introduced by National Council member Hughes Brockbank. Mr. Bell extended his greetings and hopes for continued cooperation between the Office of Education and the Councils.

Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education William Pierce then delivered a report from the Office of Education and the meeting was subsequently adjourned for the evening.

The meeting reconvened the next morning with a breakfast session hosted by Clem Bassett of the West Virginia Council. The guest speaker was Mr. Ben Burdetsky, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, who explained the administration of labor programs under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) (text on page 23).

The next session consisted of five workshops on State Plans, Evaluation, Legislative Relations, Council Management, Public Information and Citizen Views, and Local Advisory Councils.

After the workshops a luncheon meeting was hosted by Minnesota Chairperson Dorothy Thompson. The guest speaker was Florida State Congressman William Lehman who was introduced by Walter Clausen of the Florida Council. A member of the House General Education Committee, Lehman talked about plans for vocational education legislation and suggested some problem areas which he hoped would receive input from the Councils (see page 34).

Closing remarks were made by Utah Council Executive Director Jack Higbee who discussed the role of the Councils and the importance of jobs in attaining the good life (text on p. 41). The meeting was then adjourned.



# PRESENTATIONS PRESENTATIONS



Remarks by  
DR. KENNETH HOYT  
Associate Commissioner  
for Career Education

I deeply appreciate being invited to speak to you today about career education. I think that it is significant that this is, as far as I know, the first time this joint national and state group has ever had this as a major topic on its program.

Let me make a few points about career education as I see it, particularly in relationship to vocational education. I would say that career education can best be characterized as a movement which came about in response to a call for educational reform. This call was put out by students, teachers, parents, business, labor, industry, and members of the general public. That call was issued years ago and continues to be heard today. This says something is wrong with our present system of education.

I think we need not take too much time repeating what all of you have heard and continue to hear. We've heard that we've got too many people who leave our educational system without the basic academic skills needed for adapting to our rapidly changing post-industrial technology-oriented society. They can't read, write, spell or do the arithmetic needed to hold today's jobs. We've heard that too many people in our educational system don't see any clear relationship between what they learn in school and what they're going to do when they get out of school. We've heard the National Advisory Council is the first to say broadly that American education, as it currently exists, best meets the needs of a minority of students who are someday going to be college graduates and that it has not met the needs of the great majority—over eighty percent—of the students in our public schools today who are never going to be college graduates. We've all heard and continue to hear that American education has not kept pace with the rapidity of change in this post-industrial society in which we live. And as a result, this country is full of alienated workers who are either over-educated or

undereducated. And we've all heard 'til we're sick of hearing of the fact that we've got way too many people leaving our education system at the secondary, post-secondary and university levels who are not equipped with the vocational skills, the career decision-making skills or the desire to learn that is essential for making a successful transition from school to work.

Not that our educational system isn't without very notable accomplishments and there are people who say that before we criticize, we ought to take a look at some of these accomplishments. Well, we in fact have done this. We have pointed to the very high quality of the accomplishments of American education and how much we have to be proud of in terms of what has been done with our public school system. I have no objection to doing that, and in fact think it is very helpful and necessary to gain that kind of perspective. I would simply point out that giving people that kind of proper and needed perspective is not the same as providing an answer to the criticisms.

If you're going to answer criticism you've got only two ways to do so: One is to prove that it isn't true, and the other is to say how you're going to respond. I do not think you're going to convince the general public that its criticisms aren't true.

Career education, since its inception, has been viewed as a means of responding to this call for educational reform. Since 1971, it has been a top priority in the U.S. Office of Education and viewed generally as the major option for directing the public educational policy toward attainment of such reform. All the criticisms of the educational system that we've heard center around relationships between education and work and around the lifestyles of individuals. Education needs to be made applicable to all students of all ages from all kinds of environments in all educational settings. It needs to be able to provide a universally common answer to those who ask the question: "Why should I learn?" Career education seeks to do that by establishing education as preparation for work as a major goal for American education. Since 1971, we've had a lot of activity in this field, a lot of ferment, a lot of local action, but very little money. I've heard you talk today about how little money vocational education gets. It may not sound like much to you but it does to us. But that's not what I came to talk about. I came to talk about why, if career education is what is needed, don't people move faster toward

implementing it?

Of course, lately a lot of negative criticism of career education has been making the rounds. I would like to address some of the most common of these criticisms now and see if they make any sense to you.

First there are the people who say that since the Office of Education hasn't defined career education, it's silly to talk about implementing it. I would like to point out that the Office of Education has not as yet defined "education." Nor has it defined "counseling" nor "accountability" nor even "the fourth grade." Yet somehow all these things manage to exist. So it doesn't worry me too much that there are a lot of different definitions of career education. That makes it just like everything else in education. And the fact that a lot of people disagree on the specific definitions is no reason not to move ahead on career education. I came back from the National Conference on State Career Education Coordinators in Dallas a couple of weeks ago, and although we didn't have all the states and territories represented, we did have people from forty-six states and three territories, and we got better than ninety percent consensus from them on a basic generic definition of career education centering on the relationships between education and the world of work.

Now to move on to a couple of other criticisms. A lot of people say they don't want career education because it invites external control of the school system. I'd like to comment on that briefly. Career education has from the outset placed much of its emphasis on the relationship between education and work. We have said repeatedly that American education must rid itself of the assumption that the best way to get kids ready for the real world is to lock them up in school and keep them away from it. If you want to get them ready for the real world, you'd better get them into it. Further, we've said that by education we mean more than schooling. There are some people who have a very fine education but not much schooling, and vice-versa. Finally, we've said that if we're going to have career education, we're going to need people in the business-labor-industry-professional community and in the home and family structure interacting with the people in the educational system, or this has no way of working. Educators do not have all the answers. Problems which arise in relation to work experience programs, cooperative programs, the use of classroom resource persons, arrangements for

field trips to places of work, etc., all require the input from people in business and industry.

It is a triumvirate which career education seeks to establish, a collaborative triumvirate of the educational system, the business-labor-industry-professional community and the home and family structure. But how can we have collaboration if all the decisions are made by educators? I am convinced that the days of educational isolationism are in our past and those who fight to retain the concept are fighting a losing battle. Our public school system is increasingly going to be viewed as something that belongs to the public, not to those who administer our schools. Career education is only one of a number of forces at work seeking this kind of broader involvement.

A third criticism of career education is that it will lower the academic standards of high schools. The feeling here is that if instead of being required to take so many units of science, English, social studies, and mathematics the students are given a lot of options, they'll take the easy way out and fill up their schedules with a lot of mickey-mouse courses, won't learn anything, and thus the educational system will have failed again. Well, as it is, kids are dropping out of school because they aren't learning. What we're trying to do is let them see some relationship between what it is that they study in school and what they're going to do when they get out of school. For too many years students have been asking their teachers "What good is it going to do me to study this?" And for too many years the teachers have been answering them with "Shut up and study it." What we're saying is that the kids deserve a better answer than that and that if they get a better answer they'll learn more. Besides, what standards are we lowering? The ones that are trying to equip everybody to go to college. Well, eighty percent of the students don't want to go to college. And as for kids taking the easy way out, one of the reasons for that is the breakdown in communication between parents and kids. Career education offers a way to promote better communication between parents, students and the schools in terms of joint decision-making. We've got shared decision-making, career guidance, and protection of individual freedom built into the career education system all along the line. We operate on the very basic, simple assumption that if kids can see the use of what they study, they'll study harder than if they're forced. The last fifty years has



produced a lot of research evidence to back up that operational assumption.

Another criticism. Recently the vice president of a college in New York told me that liberal arts people are turned off career education and he's right. There are a lot of these people who say they don't like career education because it's anti-intellectual. Career education is NOT anti-intellectual. I would like to point out as clearly as I can that career education has never been and is in no way opposed to intellectualism. What we ARE opposed to is intellectual snobbery. We are opposed to the position that all things really worth knowing are found in books; that those who go to school the longest know the most; that those with the most education automatically deserve the most status; that it's more valuable to use only your head than both your hands and your head. If that makes us anti-intellectual, then we are anti-intellectual. I don't think, however, that this represents the position of the liberal arts people. I think that what worries them is the idea that by emphasizing relationships between education and work, we must be knocking their educational goals and objectives. Well, that just isn't so. We have never tried to build a case for career education by knocking any other worthy educational objective. All we are saying is that if students know what they're going to get out of the courses they are offered, they can better decide whether or not that's the direction they want to take. The objective of the career education scheme ought to be very clear to everyone in this room, because you've been associated with vocational education for a long time. Since 1917 vocational education has been seen as an elective for students, as something that some kids might choose to do after they've met the requirements of the liberal arts. What we're saying is that if vocational education is to be offered on an elective basis, then the other courses ought to be elective as well so students can choose among them freely.

Those of us in career education have also been criticized for saying that there's been an overemphasis on the false virtues of a college degree. We only say it because it's true. And they criticize us because we say there ought to be more people in vocational education. We say THAT because it's true. I don't think it is legitimate to criticize us for offering true statements.

Then there are the people who say they are opposed to career edu-



cation because it's an antihumanistic movement. I think that's the most unfair criticism of all. The gist of this argument is that career education is trying to salvage the free enterprise system by reviving the classical protestant work ethic, by brainwashing youth with this ethic and by preparing them to accept the kinds of dehumanizing conditions found in our industrial society today. This above all is something I hope you will take back to your states and destroy. First of all, the career education movement is not concerned with the protestant work ethic, but rather with work itself. By work we mean something much broader than paid occupations. Career education's definition of work includes unpaid work such as volunteers do as well as paid employment; it also includes what you do with your leisure time. And the word "career" of "career education" refers to the totality of your life work, beginning before you enter kindergarten and proceeding well into your retirement years. By opening options, career education seeks to help people find more meaningful and satisfying work. Yet they call it antihumanistic. Career education recognizes the course of dehumanization in the modern work place and is concerned to reverse this trend, although there are limits as to how far the workplace can be humanized. But so far as career education being antihumanistic because it is seen as an aid to the free enterprise system, we say there is nothing antihumanistic about the free enterprise system, which has at its very root the concept of individual initiative and effort. It seems to me that those who believe that it is antihumanistic to teach students about the way democracy works in terms of its basic economic principles are helping to build a general societal distrust of the free marketplace and of the concept of competition. Career education clearly seeks to restore the public confidence both in education and in the free enterprise system, and we do that openly.

There are some people that will tell you we shouldn't proceed with career education yet because it hasn't been proved to work. But of course there's no way we can prove it works if nobody lets us try. It's going to take a generation to get clear, hard evidence, but so far all indications are that it's great. The kids like school better, they're learning more, their attendance is improved, teacher-pupil relationships are better.

Some people object to career education on the grounds that it will track students. In fact, just the opposite is the case. We are trying

to UNtrack students by opening up options.

There are those who tell us career education will keep kids out of college. We don't want to keep kids out of college, we're just trying to help them figure out why they want to go if that's what they plan to do. Then we hear some people who say career education is a subterfuge for recruiting kids for vocational education. We've all said from the beginning that we are not recruiting kids for anybody or for anything. What we are trying to do is open up choices. They have said we are going to make kids choose an occupation in kindergarten. We don't even talk to kids about occupations in kindergarten, we talk to them about work. We're also talking about doing away with the stereotyping of girls and minorities in today's occupations.

Well, let me conclude with a couple of implications career education has for this kind of group. We're at a very serious stage in the career education movement. I don't know what's going to happen to it but whatever it is, it will be influenced in part by what you folks do. Let me say three things. It seems to me that career education, as the total integrated movement of the home and family, business-labor-industry, and the educational system collaborating together holds more potential for change than could ever be expected from the efforts of any single isolated part of education. And when I say no single part, I include vocational education. It cannot do this by itself. Remember that the broad goal of career education is very simple—to bring prominence and permanence to the concept of education as preparation for work on the part of all who teach and all who learn. I think had vocational education been able to accomplish this goal by itself, it would have done so sometime in the last sixty years. And I think the goal is worthy of accomplishment.

Secondly, if the career education movement is going to succeed, I will guarantee you it will involve changes in vocational education as well as in the rest of the educational system. And those who think that the change we are talking about is to make the academic teachers more like the vocational education teachers are talking about accommodation and adjustment rather than integration. I'm talking about integration and this means basic changes in both parties. Vocational education will certainly come to be seen as one of the parents of the career education movement. But—to continue the analogy of parent-

hood—career education was a child born out of wedlock, because there's never been a marriage between vocational education and career education's other parent, academic education. If ever they do achieve marriage, I think it will be in part because they both respect what this child called career education has been able to accomplish. In order for that to happen, neither parent can be in complete control.

Third, I would say on the basis of what I have seen around the country, if career education is a child, it is a healthy child. Despite the lack of funds, it's a going thing and it's going very well. Even so, you've got to recognize that it is a child, and like any other child, it needs nourishment and assistance in moving toward maturity. As one of the parents of career education, vocational education has, it seems to me, a continuing responsibility to support it with more than words. Career education needs dollars and also input into its conceptualization. It would be a tragic and I think ill-advised and very shortsighted mistake to see vocational education's support of career education cut off at this point in time as is being done. If these statements have any implications for action, it seems to me they center around the current need for some strong policy statements on behalf of the vocational education community with regard to career education. As all of us in this room know, we've gotten strong policy statements on career education from lots of different groups over the years, ever since it started. From the beginning, this joint group of NACVE-SACVE has kept quiet. I would like to offer a plea that you consider not keeping quiet very much longer. Support it or oppose it, but speak up. I hope you can support it. Thank you very much for listening.



Remarks by  
 MR. JACK JENNINGS  
 Majority Counsel  
 General Subcommittee on Education  
 U.S. House of Representatives

I would like to start off by thanking you very much for your report on the impact of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, which was submitted to Congress before our hearings on vocational education. I think that document shows quite convincingly that there is a continued need

for outside voices to be heard in vocational education. You know, all institutions—and I'm including the Congress—have a tendency to become self-protective. You find that you don't want people interfering in what you're doing and you don't especially like outsiders sitting right next to you all the time and giving you their opinions of your job performance. ~~But unfortunately, in some areas, institutions have become so ingrown and so resistant to change that there's a special need for outside commentators or outside evaluators, and I think the Congress, in 1968, saw that vocational education was one of those areas. Hence the system of advisory councils was set up at the federal and state levels in order to involve outside people in evaluating and commenting upon the way both federal and state dollars were being spent in the states for vocational education.~~

Now I know that many of your Councils have had some problems in trying to establish their independence, but I think, from what I am told, that most of those problems have been settled and that to varying degrees you have established that independence. But nonetheless, I think there is a continual need to make sure that full psychological and institutional independence is maintained, because over time, independent entities tend to be co-opted. Federal agencies like the Federal Trade Commission, the FCC and the ICC, which were set up twenty, thirty and forty years ago to regulate specific fields have been co-opted by those fields. I don't think Congress wants that to happen to the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. These Councils were set up expressly as inde-

pendent entities. Now that does not make things comfortable for a number of people, but I think that the members of Congress appreciate the impartial advice that only an independent agency can provide. This keeps them in closer touch with the true desires of their constituents—whom they face as voters every two or four years—and this helps them to do their jobs better.

Now I'm sure that administrators of state programs are made just as uncomfortable by the scrutiny of independent critics as members of Congress are. But for those of you serving on the State Councils, it is your job to evaluate your state's vocational education programs and particularly it is your job to speak for all the people in your state. You know, sometimes when you've been working in the same field for twenty or thirty years, you get in a rut. Not only are your thought patterns restricted to the traditional paths which have become established in the field, you also lose contact with the very people whom the field is supposed to serve. So it's your job—since you're not tied into the system directly—to keep vocational education in your state abreast of the current thinking and requirements of the people it is designed to serve. And by virtue of your independence you are in a position to offer criticism when criticism is due. Of course you also ought to be constructive, and I think in the vast majority cases you have been.

Let me turn to something else which I think needs your attention. Two days ago, the Committee began holding hearings on vocational education and already we've heard from some state people who are requesting that we take off all budgetary restraints, take away categorical funding and simply give them carte blanche. I find this kind of thinking very disturbing, because it represents a danger to some important programs. There were also people at the hearings who said that if appropriations had not been specifically made for certain programs, among them education and training for the handicapped, these programs would not have been funded in their states. I note with a great deal of interest that most of the State Councils have said that such set-asides should be retained in order to protect certain programs. It's not that we're accusing anyone of bad faith. But since program administrators are subject to all kinds of political pressures, it would seem wiser to protect certain important programs from the possibility of having their funds absorbed away from them, by giving the program administrators a higher authority to refer back to.

The General Accounting Office has been doing some work for us and they have found that about half the states, according to the data which they themselves supplied to the Office of Education, have not been fulfilling the set-asides for the disadvantaged, and that a large number of the states have not been fulfilling the set-asides for the handicapped. Now I recognize that some of the criticisms of the set-aside system are valid. Some of the definitions are too restrictive, some of them aren't coordinated with each other, especially in the area of the disadvantaged. But even valid criticism of a law isn't a license to disregard it. The thing to do is to correct the law. In the meantime, it should be obeyed.

In connection with all this, I wonder what it is that the Office of Education has been doing. They have the data that shows that some of the states are not obeying the law. Don't they look at it? I must confess that I don't quite understand how it is that, knowing about the problem and having the necessary staff and resources to deal with it, they haven't done anything about it. Possibly the General Accounting Office has labeled the data received from the states as preliminary findings or something like that, but it seems to me—unless it can come up with a good explanation—that the Office of Education just hasn't been doing its job. I can understand that they may feel they can't lay down directives for the states in every area, and indeed they shouldn't. But if the law specifically states that, say, fifteen percent of the funding is to be used for a given program and the data submitted shows that only ten percent was allotted for that purpose, it should be obvious to the federal people that something is wrong somewhere and that they should make an effort to get to the bottom of it.

Now let me turn to something else for a minute. I know that there's widespread feeling that when you go up before Congress to present your bills on vocational education, you should have total agreement. And I know that you're going to call some meetings for the specific purpose of achieving such agreement. But you know, our society's not built entirely on solid agreement, and there comes a time when you who represent the people within your states and country must ask yourselves whether the things you hear being proposed are really any good, or whether all their force has been compromised away in an attempt to achieve unanimity. I don't think Congress cares if there's some disagreement. Congress has disagreement enough within itself.

But I think it does want to hear why a funding request is being made. And I would hate to see the real issues get lost along the way all for the sake of unanimity.

Another thing I want to mention is consolidation. There's been a lot of talk about it and this is what all the draft bills are all about. But I would just like to point out to you that this isn't necessarily the wave of the future. Congress rejected the Administration's consolidation proposal out-of-hand this time and they wouldn't even bring it up for a vote, because there wasn't enough Republican support for it. But there was a promise that consolidation would be considered among many other things the next time around, and Congress will probably adopt some type of consolidation. But let's not be stampeded into this thing. We need to take a look at what's being consolidated. The Congress is adopting consolidations now in the field of elementary and secondary education. But they are far different from what the administration proposed, and I wouldn't be surprised if the same thing happened in vocational education. So this is something you need to keep in mind.

The last thing I want to mention is this matter of the staffing on the National Advisory Council. You know, one time when a number of your State Councils were making things uncomfortable for some of the state people, there were some efforts to restrain such things as their staffing, travel and funds. Well, it seems to me that this effort to turn all staff positions of the National Advisory Council into Civil Service slots classified by the Office of Education is an attempt to do the same thing at the national level. Or maybe they wanted a nice-looking organizational chart showing everybody coming out of the same pot of civil service jobs. But you have to consider the result of something like that. And in this case the result is that you don't have an independent evaluator of how the Office of Education and the states have been administering their programs, which is the role that Congress intended for the Advisory Councils.

Well, that about covers everything I had to say. Are there any questions?





Remarks by  
MR. BEN BURDETSKY  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
U.S. Department of Labor

I am delighted to have this opportunity to meet with you this morning and talk about CETA—the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. It seems to me that the Labor Department has spent a lot of time lately talking about CETA. We've talked about it to veterans' groups, business groups, state employment security ad-

ministrators, labor groups, Indian groups, public interest groups, women's groups—incidentally, I made the fatal mistake of showing a very nice film on CETA to a women's group in which there was not a single female presenter. Let me tell you, they lost no time in pointing that out to me. And I can assure you that is the last time that will ever happen. But anyway, there are a lot of people and groups concerned about CETA.

CETA is a whole new approach to manpower planning, training and administration in this country, and of course it's only logical that as we get closer and closer to it, there would be a lot of people and groups very concerned about how they will fit into the picture. Well, under the present system, we're administering around 10,000 separate manpower training contracts—a whole streak of categorical programs. This means that an awful lot of time is spent writing contracts, monitoring contracts, modifying contracts and auditing contracts. But under CETA, we'll only have about five hundred programs which will be administered by what we call prime sponsors. Now a prime sponsor can be a governor, an executive of any county or a mayor of any city with a population of over 100,000. We feel that this arrangement will enable us to work more closely with the cities in the manpower development phases of the program, which I think is where we should put most of our effort.

Now the CETA bill is very complex. It took several years of work to get it into its present form and I think it represents a fairly equitable arrangement, but the whole thing is an amalgam of compro-



mise. As a matter of fact, I call it the lawyers' full employment act because of the maze of possibilities and potentialities it has for legal suit. One of the complex areas of the law is in the establishment of who a prime sponsor is or can be. We have a provision for exceptional circumstances which says something to the effect that if a political jurisdiction of less than 100,000 can show that it has high unemployment and high out-migration and can demonstrate effectiveness in handling manpower programs, it may be eligible for the representation of a prime sponsor under the exceptional circumstances provision. We had 236 requests based on this provision, eleven of which were approved. Needless to say, there were 222 unhappy applicants.

The funds for the exceptional circumstance provision come out of what is normally the governor's portion of this training program because the governor has what is known as the balance of state. So the jurisdictions of less than 100,000 which would normally not be prime sponsorships are carved out of the governor's portion with his approval. Many governors have discovered that CETA offers them far less than they had thought when it was first being put together. In New York state, for example, there are thirty-seven prime sponsors. After thirty-seven bites are taken out of the pie, there isn't much left.

To move along to another exception: Certain rural concentrated employment programs may be designated as prime sponsors. The other day we announced four such designations selected from about eleven or twelve requests, based on some pretty good criteria relating to performance.

Now let me mention a couple of the key factors in CETA which make it different from previous manpower training programs. First of all, it eliminates over a score of categorical manpower training programs; secondly, it's a highly decentralized mode of operation with local planning of manpower programs by local people to meet local needs, the theory being that local people are in the best position to know what is needed in their communities. So we will not have 10,000 contractors any longer; the federal role will be to deal with prime sponsors, who in turn will have ultimate responsibility for funding the manpower programs in their communities and dealing with any subcontractors they decide to use. Our regional offices, which up to now have been administering contracts, will be responsible

under CETA for reviewing the plans submitted by prime sponsors.

I must say, however, that the law in its final form does not divest the Secretary of any responsibility for making sure that the programs are carried out effectively. There has been a lot of concern about special revenue sharing and this, of course, is the first effort at a major substantive revenue sharing program. So the Secretary will be looking behind all the programs and certifications to make sure that the plans that are submitted are carefully conceived in terms of the populations of the community and the needs of the underemployed and unemployed, to make sure that these programs basically represent the needs of the constituents in the jurisdiction. Also the Secretary has a veto authority. Appropriate appeals procedures were of course established, but the Secretary can ultimately decide that a plan is unacceptable, in which case he may ask another prime sponsor to run that program or decide to run it himself. We don't know what will happen the first time we have a veto. That will be an interesting experience. And we hope we don't have any, but in case we do, we have that control built into the system.

In monitoring the programs against the plans submitted by the prime sponsors, we will set up a quarterly system of reviewing results. I think a very important function of the Department of Labor will be to conduct a continuing evaluation program. It has been my observation over the years that one of the major flaws of federal programs has been the lack of a well conceived evaluation system built in at the outset, including a design for quick information retrieval. This program will have such a system.

A final and major role of the federal government will be to provide technical assistance to the prime sponsors on a range of things, such as program administration, budgeting and finance; to help explore ideas that are being carried out in one prime sponsor's jurisdiction with another; and to serve as a clearinghouse for information.

Now Title I under CETA is the major provision with respect to prime sponsors. It deals for the most part with the mainline types of manpower training programs. A formula is used for the distribution of funds which takes into account the existing manpower level in the state or prime sponsor's area; the jurisdiction's unemployment as compared to the national unemployment level; and the area's percentage of poverty. Let me tell you that in the drafting of the

bill the computers were very busy, working on a dozen different types of formulas to find one that would satisfy all the members of Congress involved in deciding upon the distribution process—they are of course very much interested in what their folks back home are going to get out of all this—and I think it ended up being a pretty fair type of formula and distribution process.

Title II has a public employment provision in which funds will be provided to prime sponsors and jurisdictions where the unemployment rate has been six and a half percent or higher for three consecutive months. These funds will be used to employ people who have been out of work for thirty days or more. No one is eligible to participate in such a program for more than two years, so it does not provide a steady job for anyone for an indefinite period. Now in response to the energy crisis, which boosted the declining unemployment rate of last fall back to the level of the previous spring, both the House and the Senate versions of the bill appropriated very substantial increases in funds for public service employment.

In addition to these Title II funds, we have Title I provisions for public employment service. This came about because under the old emergency employment act, there were a lot of people working for state and local governments whose jobs were going to be terminated because of the expiration of that act, and with the high unemployment rate increasing, it seemed desirable to keep them on if at all possible. So Title I provides for an employment program to replace the old emergency employment service, and thus it has come about that both Title I and Title II contain provisions for public employment programs. It's very interesting. I can't figure it all out, but I hope the President doesn't veto it, because it comes to about \$500 million above what was asked. That's the way things happen sometimes.

Now I suppose I had better modify my statement that there will be no more categorical programs, because under Title III there are a couple. Such a set-aside has been established for Indian training programs, which Indians, as prime sponsors, will run themselves. We're developing regulations and working very closely with the various Indian groups on almost a daily basis to come up with an acceptable way to operate with them. Another categorically funded program under Title III will be for migrant workers. It has been felt that, as with the Indians, their situation requires special attention. There's a widespread fear that the local level will not provide for such spe-

cial attention, so that's why these categorical programs were established by federal law. Title III also provides for labor market information, research and development, and a discretionary fund for the Secretary to use for other programs which he feels can best be run on a national basis.

Title IV continues the Job Corps. Up until this appeared in the bill, we had a very nervous group of people who thought the Job Corps was on its way out, but I think the Congress has made it clear that it does want an effective Job Corps program.

Title V establishes a National Commission for Manpower Policy. In other words, the old National Manpower Advisory Council is no longer in existence. This new Commission has a number of Cabinet officers assigned to it. The President is now in the process of choosing people to serve on this Commission—a body which will have the broad responsibility for determining what kinds of manpower programs ought to be thought through for the country as a whole, and to generally evaluate the overall impact of manpower programs in this country.

Title VI is kind of an overall title, but one provision in it which merits special mention is the Equal Employment Opportunity provision. In the early discussions about revenue sharing and decentralization, it was clear that many groups—be they in manpower, education, transportation or whatever—distrusted a decentralized system. Because equal employment opportunity had had so many problems at the local level, these groups were afraid that placing program responsibility and funds in the hands of local administrators would deal a severe blow to the establishment of fair employment practices. So Title VI protects equal employment opportunity.

There are two kinds of councils which the Act mandates that I'd like to mention. One is a manpower services council, which each state governor is required to establish and which has statewide responsibility. There are a couple of mandated seats on that council, one of which is for the vocational education board and the other for the state employment service. There are a variety of other types of organizations which the governors can invite to serve on that council. Then there is the manpower planning council that each of the prime sponsors is required to set up. This Council is to be broadly based. The law does not specifically designate any group or individual to serve on it. It sort of implies that any interested group

concerned with manpower training, vocational education, rehabilitation or apprenticeship should make an effort to become part of the planning process at the local level. So I think that this group and others like it should find out what is happening at the prime sponsor's level, where these planning councils are being formed, and be sure that the interests of vocational education—in your case—are well known and considered in any plans made. The plans are being put together at this time, and the earlier these interested groups—your group—gets involved in this process, the better the chance that their input will be incorporated into the plans, which will then come to the regional offices for review. None of the existing systems—the state employment service, vocational rehabilitation—are presumed to be deliverers. It's merely up to them to convince the prime sponsors that they have the system to use. Then when the Department of Labor reviews the plans, they'll ask questions beginning with such phrases as "did you consider...", "why didn't you include...", etc. But in the final analysis, the prime sponsor is ultimately responsible for seeing to it that an effective delivery system is set up.

There is one section of the Act which is of particular interest to this group, and that is a five percent set-aside given to the governor for vocational education. The amount is figured according to the same formula as that used in Title I. Based on the plans and agreements reached between vocational education boards and prime sponsors, the governor can then utilize these funds to deliver services in the prime sponsor's jurisdiction. If the prime sponsor doesn't come up with a good plan for the use of these funds, however, they can be used elsewhere. So you need to be aware of these funds. Don't ignore the big money in Title I, which can be used for an infinite variety of training purposes, including vocational education. It comes to \$1.3 billion or so. But then there is this five percent set-aside for vocational education, which represents about \$70 million or so, and that's no small amount.

The whole purpose and spirit of the new legislation is to use local initiative and know-how to more closely meet the employment and training needs of the unemployed and underemployed in this country. The only way that this system is going to work is to make sure that the governors, mayors, and county executives have advisory councils that truly represent the broad interests of the community. That's why

the Advisory Council must represent not only the people who need the services, but also the employers, the general public and the major agencies providing services to people. You can see why it's imperative that vocational education viewpoints be represented on both the state and local manpower advisory councils. Of all the professional groups allied with manpower workers, there are few which have a closer identification with our goals and credos than the vocational education professionals. We need your continued concern and cooperation, especially as we plow ahead to implement this exciting new legislation. If there's anything that we can do to clarify our objectives or explain how we might work together more effectively, I hope you will let us know.

Thank you very much.



Remarks by  
THE HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN  
Congressman  
State of Florida

I understand that last year Lloyd Meeds addressed this gathering about the problem of federal revenue sharing. That problem has not disappeared. The Administration has now given it the code name of consolidation. Lloyd must have taken consolidation to heart because he has been appointed one of the ten people on

the select committee to consolidate the committees in Congress. We call it reform, and under the leadership of this committee we're going to try to rearrange the committee structure in the House of Representatives so that it can perform more efficiently. There are at present no committees to deal solely with energy, environment, or health. So Lloyd and the other nine members are working on that kind of consolidation.

In the thrust toward consolidation, for the '74-75 school year the Administration will be advancing a fund for vocational education with a proposed supplemental appropriation. Congressman Steiger, a Republican Congressman on our committee—the Education-Labor Committee—was trying to work out a form of vocational education consolidation of the H.R. '69 bill with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but it looks as though this may not be the way the consolidation will go. We're holding hearings at the present time from week to week on the ways that we can best and most efficiently deal with the future aspects of vocational education.

The whole issue of consolidation has made the Democratic members of the committee in particular a little uneasy. Just looking at this year's budget for instance, there are few categorical programs which received greater funding in '74 than in '73. Funding for the State Advisory Councils did increase, of course. They received \$28 million more than they did in 1973. But the basic grants to the state are down about \$21.3 million and co-op education remains at the same level, which is in effect, as you know, a decrease in funding pro-

portionate to the rate at which inflation increases.

Yet vocational education's record is successful. Enrollments in its programs have tripled since 1960. As I see it, what science and math were to the post-Sputnik '60s, vocational education is going to be to the 1970s. I would, however, like to inject a note of caution. You know how the structural linguistics of the 1960s, which was seen as the wave of the future, has now come under widespread attack. Well, unless vocational education in the '70s is planned for the future, it'll end up in the '80s as the kind of has-been that structural linguistics and the new math are now. So we need to guard against that.

But state spending on vocational education has definitely increased in recent years. In my own state of Florida, the increase has really been enormous. I think Florida was one of the first states to realize the forthcoming need for and impact of vocational education. In 1965 we spent about \$18 million on voc ed. In '73 this figure had increased to \$38 million and by '75 we're projecting about \$105 million. The fact is that federal spending in vocational education generates more state dollars than any other single factor. Even three years ago, close to \$5 of state funds were generated by matching funds and other arrangements with every federal dollar that was programmed into those states. My own observation is that vocational education at this time is really at a critical point in its lifespan. In the next ten years, it will either pick up steam and shed its negative image or it will lose whatever gain it has made in recent years.

Another concern of mine is that as vocational education gains in the public schools there will be a mass exodus from the public schools to the private and parochial schools and we'll end up with public schools being predominately trade or voc ed schools and the private schools as academic schools. That's one of the things you're going to have to watch out for.

This year I traveled to Israel to study their vocational education program because I had heard that next to Switzerland, Israel probably has the finest vocational education program in the world. Switzerland, I think, still has the best. In fact, last night I was out to dinner with the owner of a very large knitting mill in Miami. I asked him where he had learned to operate knitting machinery and he said, "I went to Switzerland like everybody else." There was no school in



this country where he could have learned how to operate machinery of that complexity, so he had to go to Switzerland. But back to my trip to Israel. They have a really exceptional voc ed system there. The Jewish people, who for centuries have put commerce and the professions above manual skills, in Israel have enrolled nearly sixty percent of their fifteen- to twenty-year-old students in vocational education. And there are two to three applications for every possible opening.

I'd like to share with you some observations I made about some aspects of that vocational education system which I think would be applicable in this country. In some states, of course, they're already being applied, but I feel their application might be broadened. The first one I want to mention is that they use very serious, complicated machinery in their vocational education programs. Second, the instructors don't come from teacher training schools; they come from industry and are then trained in teaching. These teachers keep up with the very latest in industrial techniques. As a matter of fact, each of the instructors has to spend a certain amount of time every few years working within the industry to keep abreast of latest developments. The teacher-pupil ratio is kept at a maximum of ten to one. The vocational schools are built right into the factories themselves. This struck me as a very sensible arrangement; there's no reason to place the vocational training facility in the wing of a high school five miles from the nearest factory, when that same facility could be conveniently located within the factory. You would of course have English and math teachers on location also, but that presents no real problem.

Another thing: What they don't have in the schools in the way of equipment, they build. For example, if they don't have a lathe or a drill press, they build it because they've got the equipment to do so. But most important of all, everything those kids make in school is used. It might be an electronic device which will end up in a hospital. Or it might be a lathe that will be used in private industry somehow. But whatever it is, it won't be a useless piece of make-work, some trifle the kid takes home to Mama saying, "Look what I made in voc ed class today." No. It will become a part of the economic process of the country.

Now I realize that everything I've been talking about isn't necessarily adaptable here and of course each country has its own econ-

omic and business needs and requires a system adapted to them. But as it is now, the schools throughout the country are finding that much of the curriculum is really dull and irrelevant to the needs of their students.

A few years ago I visited one of those model schools they used to have on the campuses of universities offering education programs. This one was a K-12 school at Florida A&M University in Tallahassee. First I went to the first grade class. You should have just seen the enthusiasm those kids showed. I left the first grade and went on to the second and so on all the way up through high school. By the time I got there, all the enthusiasm was gone. So I asked the principal why this should happen, and he replied that by the time the kids have reached high school they have been turned off by the educational system. And I think that that's something that you're going to have to do something about.

One of the things we're doing in Dade County as a pilot program is putting career education into the elementary schools to provide the kids identification with something they can do when they get out of school even ten years before they actually do so. But we must be careful not to neglect the liberal arts. When a student has completed his or her secondary education in vocational education, that young person should be qualified either to enter the job market with a salable skill or to continue his or her academic education at the university level.

I know the National Advisory Council has recognized these problems for a long time. They've been around for a long time. Vocational education has been seen as something for somebody else's kids for a long time. Something for kids with behavior problems or for kids who couldn't afford to go to college. But all those youngsters with academic training are now having trouble finding a job because they don't have a salable skill. And this is the kind of situation that our educational system will be facing more and more.

When I first began selling used cars back in the late '30s, construction workers who pushed a wheelbarrow were my biggest group of customers. Among the women, my biggest group was the elevator operators. But I haven't sold a used car to an elevator operator or a wheelbarrow pusher in ten years. This is indicative of a national trend. More and more present-day jobs will be replaced by machinery and the people who have the necessary skills to operate it.

Current estimates indicate that in a few years only five percent of the total jobs in America will be available to those people who have no skill training. But there are trends within trends. In the field of skilled jobs, there's a broad shift from production-oriented jobs to service jobs, which will require a different kind of training, oriented more toward the ability to communicate and the acquisition of social skills.

And more important, while qualification for the entry-level position into an occupation is a necessity, it is no guarantee of success and satisfaction. We need follow-through guidance and counseling to help our young people find stable and satisfactory careers. They need to know how to get along with their bosses and co-workers and how to maintain the kind of customer relationships and work habits necessary for a successful job experience. I was disturbed to learn that few funds are being expended on guidance and counseling in vocational education. In FY '72 this area was allotted only 3.7 percent of the total vocational education budget.

In addition to greater emphasis on counseling for students still attending school, as I mentioned, we must also consider ways to implement follow-up programs. A counselor's job should not end when a student takes his or her first job. If we're going to be serious about career education, then we're going to have to deal with the student on a continuing basis rather than making college the cut-off point. One thing that I've heard over and over from voc ed teachers is that they don't know what happens to kids after they get out of high school.

The United States Office of Education estimates that nearly 2.5 billion students leave the formal education system before high school and college each year without adequate preparation for a career. There are too many people who, upon getting out of high school and finding that they don't have salable skills, are led by their frustration into crime or the fringes of it in an effort to attain something of the American dream. I was reading in Newsweek that nobody is advancing faster than the people at the top of minority groups and that nobody's getting left further behind than the people at the bottom of those same minority groups. So we're going to have to target ourselves to deal with that segment of our society that's getting left further and further behind. Career education cannot be effective in dealing with such problems if it is reserved for the high school and

college levels. There's no reason why you can't start talking careers when the kid first learns how to read and write.

Now while I'm here talking to you, let me mention an item in H.R. 69 which may cause a slight problem. The one thing I accomplished in my first year as Congressman was the initiation of the community school program which has become part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. You'll be hearing something about the community schools in relation to adult vocational education. Let me emphasize that they're two different things. The community school program is non-structured and non-competitive with adult vocational education. It's not something that's going to subvert you, but rather will be a recreational and cultural enrichment program to supplement and complement the adult vocational education program.

Another thing I want to bring up is this issue of sex stereotyping in vocational education. There's no reason that any vocational education program that I know of should not be available and even actively promoted for women as well as men. And that goes for the industries they train people for as well. Take the automobile industry. As an automobile man, I feel I can speak with some authority on it, and I don't see how any industry could be more guilty of stereotyping women right out of the picture. The other day, the President of General Motors was testifying before our Work/Study Committee on Higher Education and I asked him what General Motors was doing to put women into the kinds of training and engineering programs which up to now have practically constituted an exclusively male domain. And there was really nothing he could say, because they haven't done anything in this area. These are the kinds of doors vocational education can help to open. In all of Miami, there's not a single new car saleswoman. And that's ridiculous.

Now before I leave you, I'd like to bring up a couple of problems in relation to work/study programs. One is the unrealistic wage scale used in these programs. I'd like to see you direct some effort toward changing that. Another thing is the kind of work available through these programs, which are targeted either toward the school itself or some non-profit private organization rather than toward private industry. Thus a person in a college work/study program might be given a broom and told to sweep out the gym. Now I ask you, what kind of meaningful learning experience is that? And just consider

that that same person could probably go five miles down the road and get some real skilled training at a factory or some other place of business. The trouble is, the government won't fund that. So this is something we're trying to change. But in order to do that, we've got to remove the restrictions which confine college level work/study programs to the private sector. And in order to do that we really need your help. So as a member of the General Education Subcommittee, I'll be looking forward to hearing from you about this program, as well as in regard to other things, and I certainly hope that you will give me the benefit of any suggestions you may have.



Remarks by  
**MR. JACK HIGBEE**  
 Executive Director  
 Utah State Advisory Council  
 for Vocational  
 and Technical Education

In Utah we have a magnificent new lake called Lake Powell. About three or four weeks ago, I was planning to go down there and was talking to someone else who was also planning to go. He said to me, "Jack, you know, the good life comes as a result

of a good liberal arts education. For example, here we are, going to Lake Powell. Now to really appreciate it, you need to know botany so you can appreciate the vegetation and you need to know geology so you can understand those magnificent rock formations."

I looked at him. "You know," I said, "that's really for the birds. To appreciate Lake Powell, what you need most is a boat." And it goes without saying that to have a boat, you've got to have a job.

It seems to me that the good life begins with a good job. It doesn't end there, of course, and there's certainly more to the good life than work. But without a job, there's no rich, rewarding life.

About three or four weeks ago my daughter came home with a boyfriend who had been at Brigham Young University for seven years. I asked him what he had been studying for those seven years.

"Well," he said, "I got a degree in drama."

"Oh," I said. "You planning to go into the theatre?"

"No," he replied. "I just didn't know what else to take and I happened to like drama." Later I learned that the degree in drama had taken five years and that the last two years had been devoted to graphics.

"Graphics?" I asked. "Why graphics?"

He looked at me. "Well, after all Mr. Higbee, I've got to get a job." You know, I just couldn't help but think what a shame it was he hadn't come to that realization five years ago.

Now if a student wants to become a history teacher, he ought to go to school and study history. If he wants to become a music teacher

or write music, then by all means he should study music. But if the fact is that, although he enjoys music or history, he has no intention of working in one of these fields, then he should use his educational opportunity to prepare him for a career he does intend to pursue and take history or music as a minor.

Two weeks ago, I was speaking before a group of teachers and at the end of my talk they asked me what kinds of responses the Advisory Council gets to our position that education ought to prepare students for jobs. I began my answer with one of the positive responses, the one about the good life beginning with a good job. But there's another response we get which goes something like this: people in today's world are apt to change their occupations four or five, maybe even six times. Therefore, it's useless to prepare someone to hold a specific job. The thing to do is to prepare people to be flexible so that they can get any number of different jobs they might want to try during the course of a lifetime. Well, I submit to you that if a person doesn't get his first job, we need not worry about the second, third, fourth or fifth. Anyway, it's amazing—I'm sure most of you'll agree—how easy it is to get your second, third and fourth jobs once you've held down your first.

There's another argument that needs some comment. The first time I heard it was nine years ago, but it's still alive today. Nine years ago when I was working for Litton Industries, I was at a college graduation ceremony where the chairman of our board was giving an address. And he told that group of graduates that Litton—a company employing some ninety thousand people—wanted its corporate presidents and division general managers to have good liberal educations. "We want these people to know philosophy, history, geology and all those subjects," he said. Well, of course the professors and school administrators heard him say this and thought to themselves, "Okay, if we're going to prepare our people for Litton and other such large companies, we had better provide them with a good liberal arts background." At that time I was working in the personnel department of Litton's, so I know what happened when some of those liberal arts people applied there. What they found out was that we were not hiring division presidents. We weren't hiring general managers. What we were hiring were accountants, engineers, quality inspectors, technicians and secretaries. It's misleading to say that the top jobs go to people with well-rounded educations. Sure the divi-

sion presidents at Litton are well rounded. But it's amazing how much of their education was picked up along the way as they climbed the ladder within the organizational structure. They started out with specific jobs. They didn't start out as division presidents.

Another argument comes from my own area, the personnel field. Now according to this argument, the reason that most people lose their jobs is their inability to get along with their fellow workers rather than because they lack the technical skill. They can't relate to their co-workers, so they get fired. Therefore, the best way to prepare students for successful careers is to emphasize an understanding of human relations and psychology. But the problem with this is that the student doesn't get the job in the first place unless he has a skill. I would submit that the ability to get along with people and the ability to apply a skill are equally important.

You know, vocational education is the winning team. Great things are happening in this nation in vocational education. We're winning. Let me give you a couple of examples from my own state. The Granite School District now offers thirty-five separate vocational programs. You know Ted Bell, our new Commissioner, was the superintendent at Granite before coming here. And when he took over that job about three years ago, one of the high schools out there—Olympus High—had only twelve vocational programs. Now they've got twenty-eight. They've got programs in horticulture, carpet laying, masonry, fashion merchandising and health occupations to name a few. Of course, career education has been one of Ted Bell's top priorities for a long time, and I think we're really fortunate to have him back here in Washington. I can't see any reason why he wouldn't still say that career education will be a major thrust.

You know, you hear a lot of talk about a pool of unemployed young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four. In Utah, since we started making records twelve years ago, we've been able to see that this pool has grown bigger every year until last year when, for the first time, it actually shrank. Traditionally, the easiest way to get out of that pool in our state has been to turn twenty-five years of age. But this is changing and vocational education is doing a lot to change it.

We have nine post-secondary institutions in Utah, enrollments for which have been declining for the last couple of years. This year,



although total enrollments are down again, vocational enrollments have gone up. Weaver College lost five hundred students last year but they gained six hundred vocational students. It looks like parents have finally realized that vocational education may very well be for their own children.

So we've come a long way, but we've got a long way to go. The State Advisory Council has been able to accomplish some things. I don't think vocational education in my state would have moved without it. We don't administer anything, of course. We advise, we consult, we promote, we evaluate. And we make sure that it happens. This is our responsibility. It seems to me that our responsibility—and I heard Ken Hoyt mention this—is to help relate education to job opportunities. And as I looked at some of your evaluation reports, I saw that this has been your concern. I think if we continue to promote it, we'll be assuring the growth of vocational education. After all, the best information we have to date is that eighty percent of the jobs require less than a four-year college degree, and of course this is where vocational education comes in.

But the Councils need money. I'm from one of the minimally funded states and we haven't had enough money to operate. We cannot operate on \$35,000 and do a job at all. If we don't get more than \$35,000 next year, we'll be out of business unless our State Board supplements us this year as it did last year. And when you get money from the State Board, there are some psychological strings attached to it. Oh, they tell me there aren't any, but I find I have to be kind of careful so as not to offend people like the State Superintendent of Public Instruction with any of my remarks. At the last State Board meeting the Deputy Superintendent accused me of coming on strong. We'd had a bit of a hassle because I'd told him that the Council was going to make a recommendation to the State Board which the staff didn't happen to want us to make. As I told him, it's our business to advise the Board and not the staff, but that didn't stop him from giving me an argument about it. It's when you get into sticky little situations like this that you'd like to have total financial independence. It's really pretty essential to the kind of job we're supposed to do.

And I would like to say to the states which receive more funds that it behooves you to support the smaller states in their struggle to receive adequate funding, because unless we get it, we may not be able to do the job we're supposed to do, and this could result in the

dissolution of the whole advisory council system.

Let me leave you with the statement that we can go back to our states with the knowledge that we are winning. The battle is being won. But let's also go back with the determination to do even more. Let's not be part-time executive officers. Let's not be part-time chairmen. Let's not be part-time Advisory Council members. If vocational education does not succeed in our states, we can always blame the U.S. Office of Education, the State Board, the legislature, or some other agency. But if it does fail, there's no getting around the fact that as Advisory Councils we'll be participating in that failure. By the same token, if it succeeds, we'll be participating in that success. Let's make it happen in our states. Let's go home and make it work.